

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 7-9 remain in the application for consideration of the Examiner.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

The drawings were objected to.

By the instant amendment, a replacement drawing sheet is enclosed by separate letter.

It is respectfully submitted that the proposed changes overcome the objections to the drawings.

The disclosure was objected to because of informalities.

By the instant amendment, the specification has been amended to take into consideration the concerns of the Examiner.

It is respectfully submitted that the specification is now free from informalities.

Claims 1 and 7-9 were objected to because of informalities.

By the instant amendment, Claims 1 and 7-9 have been amended to take into consideration the helpful comments of the Examiner.

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1 and 7-9 are free from informalities.

Claims 3-6 and 8-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Since no reasons are provided for this rejection, clarification is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1 and 7-9 are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 1 and 7-9 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

The Examiner's attention is directed to the filing receipt of the instant application where the Patent Office has listed this application as a divisional of 10/314,833.

Applicants respectfully submit that by asserting a restriction requirement and requiring a divisional, the Patent Office cannot now enforce a double patenting rejection.

Furthermore, since the two applications have the same filing date it is not possible to extend in monopoly since both should expire on the same day.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1 and 7-9 are in full compliance with the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yokosawa.

Claims 1 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over alleged applicants admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of Yokosawa.

It is respectfully submitted that AAPA does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention including the drive circuit including a clamp circuit.

Applicants agree with the Examiner as evidence by the Office Action.

Furthermore, Yokosawa does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention including the clamp circuit to hold the drain terminal of the current output MOS transistor at a predetermined potential.

Yokosawa discloses that the clamp circuit 28 clamps the gate potential of the source follower transistor 8.

The gate and drain are different aspects.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

While it is believed that the instant response places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to the deposit account of Texas Instruments Incorporated, Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,



W. Daniel Swayze, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 34,478

Texas Instruments Incorporated  
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999  
Dallas, TX 75265  
(972) 917-5633